

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/469,972	DENKER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael I Poe	1732	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Rejected - Final

(1) Michael I Poe (Examiner).

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Stephen Jensen (Applicant's attorney).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 21 September 2004

**Time:** 5:00 pm

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None specifically*

Claims discussed:

*1-90*

Prior art documents discussed:

*The prior art of record*


**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called the applicant's attorney to discuss proposed amendments necessary to place the application in condition for allowance. The examiner indicated that the arguments presented in the Appeal Brief filed on June 4, 2004 were found persuasive by the examiner, and therefore the claims in the application were in condition for allowance except for the presence of non-elected species claims 49-70. As such, the examiner proposed canceling claims 49-70 without prejudice. The examiner further proposed changing the title so that it better reflected the allowable invention. During the telephone interview, the applicant's attorney approved the examiner's proposed amendments and authorized the examiner to proceed with the agreed upon changes via Examiner's Amendment.